

To: Nikki Haskett[nhaskett@blm.gov]
Cc: Cally Younger[cyounger@blm.gov]; McAlear, Christopher[cmcalear@blm.gov]; Timothy Fisher[tjfisher@blm.gov]; Sally Butts[sbutts@blm.gov]; Mary Isaac[misaac@blm.gov]; Kristin Bail[kbail@blm.gov]; Leah Baker[lbaker@blm.gov]; Heather Bernier[hbernier@blm.gov]
From: Tryon, Steve
Sent: 2017-12-15T18:53:46-05:00
Importance: Normal
Subject: Re: National Monument Priority List
Received: 2017-12-15T18:53:49-05:00

Thanks, Nikki. One last note and then I will put away my pen and go on vacation. As we were talking earlier this week, we really do need to communicate to the NM units that are funded in the PTA for new starts - places like Berryessa and Mojave Trails - that they need to not obligate any funding till we can find out whether everybody still makes the cut. I believe 210 has been doing that informally. Now that you've got a priority list to work from, it makes it easier for them to communicate the start/stop/pause message within the world of planners.

Thanks!

Steve Tryon
Deputy Assistant Director, Resources and Planning
Bureau of Land Management
1849 C Street, NW
Room 5654
Washington, DC 20240
202-208-4896

On Fri, Dec 15, 2017 at 6:45 PM, Nikki Haskett <nhaskett@blm.gov> wrote:

Thanks Steve, we are looking now to see what 1711 funds we have. A few years ago the 1610 rule in practice was they would pay for everything but amendments so we would try to help out with any high priority amendments like GSENM - with 1711 funds. I would say 1-5 are the highest priorities and really 1 and 2 right now since we really don't know what Presidential actions will come for the others from the Final Report. However it could be sooner than later than we need to respond to more Proclamations, or do plan reviews of all the monuments to address various issues which could be addressed in a variety of ways.

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 15, 2017, at 5:52 PM, Tryon, Steve <stryon@blm.gov> wrote:

Thanks, Nikki. Thanks for coordinating on this exercise as we figure out how to fund bureau priorities. I am bringing in Kristin and WO 210, for awareness and potential follow-up next week. [I'll be on A/L.]

If I am reading the first document correctly, the highest priority plans are numbers 1 to 6?

For my own knowledge, how often has 171X been used to prepare monument management plans? As I've discussed with you, subactivity 1610 is also being pushed to speed up "energy plans" by adding funding to their contracts. Unless we get a final appropriation that is close to the House mark, we may not be able to beef up energy plans and MMPs for items 1-6 at the same time.

Is there any room in the 171X budget to help these priority plans?

Thanks!

st

Steve Tryon
Deputy Assistant Director, Resources and Planning
Bureau of Land Management
1849 C Street, NW
Room 5654
Washington, DC 20240
202-208-4896

On Fri, Dec 15, 2017 at 2:35 PM, Haskett, Nikki <nhaskett@blm.gov> wrote:

Cally, Chris, Steve,
Attached is the draft NM Priority List that we developed for your review. Steve and I spoke and it sounds like there may be funding to allocate from 1610 for the highest priorities. We are also taking a hard look at our 400 funds and will let you know what's available. Sally and Tim are coordinating this list with the 3356 action plan since this one is responsive to all orders, proclamations, and other recent actions.

The table in the write up has more detailed information regarding the "concerns" from the final report that needs to be addressed. I also created a one page summary priority table for a quick look (pdf attached).

Nikki Haskett (Moore)
Acting Deputy Assistant Director
National Conservation Lands and Community Partnerships
Bureau of Land Management, Washington D.C.
202.219.3180 (o)